



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/693,781	10/20/2000	Dushan G. Monchilovich	06763.105001	8557

7590

07/13/2004

King & Spalding
191 Peachtree Street NE
45th Floor
Atlanta, GA 30303

EXAMINER

WANG, LIANG CHE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/693,781

Applicant(s)

MONCHILOVICH ET AL.

Examiner

Liang-che Alex Wang

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-20, 23-28, 30-33 and 36-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 21, 22, 29, 34 and 35 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 18-40 have been examined

Claim Objections

2. Claims 21-22, 29, 34-35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 40 recites the limitation "a program module providing access to a distributed computer network, said program module being operable to implement the method of Claim 1" in Claim 40 lines 6-7. However, there is no claim 1 in the pending application. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2155

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

6. Claims 18-20, 23-28, 33, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Smiga et al., US Patent Number 6,421,678, hereinafter Smiga..
7. Referring to claim 18, Smiga has taught a method for using a distributed computer network (Col 24 line 54- Col 25 line 12, figures 19-20) to facilitate collaboration between clients working on a common project (Col 23 lines 59-67 and Col 1 lines 16-19), wherein the distributed computer comprises client computers (Figure 8 items 200s) and a central database (item 850; Col 21 lines 46-53), said method comprising the step of:
 - a. publishing project specific data in a plurality of project data fields to the central database (Col 10 lines 40-54, figures 15-16, variety of different object types are viewed as a plurality of project data fields);
 - b. assigning a global unique identifier to each project data field of the plurality of project data fields (Col 22 lines 23-26; Col 44 lines 37-67);

Art Unit: 2155

- c. mapping the global unique identifier for each project data field to an associated local data field for the project specific data maintained in the client computers (Col 25 lines 55-67, Col 26 lines 1-50);
 - d. exchanging information related to the common project between the client computers, wherein the exchanged information is matched to the associated local data field maintained in the client computers based upon each global unique identifier (Col 23 lines 59-67, Col 26 lines 51-65).
- 8. Referring to claim 19, Smiga has further taught wherein said exchange step comprises the steps of: selecting information to exchange between a first client computer and a second client computer (Col 23 lines 64-67), wherein the information comprises a plurality of local data fields maintained in the first client computer, and wherein each local data field in the first client computer is associated with a respective global unique identifier (Col 26 lines 37-50); and transmitting the information from the first client computer to the second client computer, wherein the transmitted information is matched to a corresponding local data field maintained in the second client computer based upon the respective global unique identifier associated with each local data field maintained in the first client computer (Col 23 lines 64-67, Col 26 lines 42-50.)
- 9. Referring to claim 20, Smiga has further taught the step of obtaining from the central database addressing information associated with the second computer, wherein the information is transmitted from the first client computer to the second client computer according to the addressing information (Col 24 lines 19-34.)

Art Unit: 2155

10. Referring to claim 23, Smiga has further taught wherein said exchanging step further comprises exchanging information without storing the information in the central database (Col 26 table 1, Smiga has taught in the peer-to-peer embodiment that exchanged information are stored in the local database, not the central database.)
11. Referring to claim 24, Smiga has further taught, the step of storing confidential information for a specific client on a specific client database connected to the central database of the distributed computer network, wherein the specific client retains ownership of the confidential information stored on the specific client database (Col 26 lines 51-65.)
12. Referring to claim 25, Smiga has further taught wherein said exchanging step comprises exchanging information related to a plurality of common projects between client computers (Col 23 lines 61-67.)
13. Referring to claim 26, Smiga has further taught the step of storing the global unique identifier for each project data field in the central database (Col 22 lines 23-25.)
14. Referring to claim 27, Smiga has further taught the steps of:
 - a. sending an invitation from a first client computer that invites a second client to collaborate on the common project (Col 28 lines 1-2, sending action request to other party);
 - b. responding to the invitation at a second client computer by one of accepting or rejecting the invitation (Col 30 lines 50-59, 62-63.)
15. Referring to claim 28, Smiga has further taught wherein said mapping step comprises the steps of: comparing a particular local data field maintained in particular client computer

Art Unit: 2155

to a particular project data field published in the central database; determining if the particular local data field corresponds to the particular project data field based on a result of said comparing step; and in the event that the particular local data field corresponds to the particular project data field, assigning the global unique identifier associated with the particular project data field to the particular local data field (Col 25 line 55 – Col 26 line 65.)

16. Referring to claims 33 and 36, claims 33 and 36 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 18, 24 and 26. Therefore, claims 33 and 36 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 18, 24 and 26.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claims 30-32, 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smiga in view of Smith, US Patent Number 5,715,454, hereinafter Smith.
19. Referring to claim 30, Smiga has taught an invention as described in claim 18. Smiga has taught information exchanged between the client computers. Smiga has not explicitly taught the step of tracking changes to determine whether an old version of the information and a new version of the information exist.

However, Smith has taught tracking changes to determine whether an old version of the information and a new version of the information exist (Col 1 line 64 to Col 2 line 4).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the tracking step of Smith in Smiga such that to have Smiga's collaborating system include the tracking step to determine the current status of version because Smith has taught a version control of documents which could be apply to Smiga's collaborative system.

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Singh because a database version control method of Smith assures consistency of computer information (abstract.)

20. Referring to claim 31, Smiga as modified has further taught wherein said tracking step comprises the steps of: recording tracked changes to the information in a document table, wherein the document table includes data associated with the old version and the new version; and setting a status in the document table if the old version is outdated (Col 1 line 64 to Col 2 line 4).
21. Referring to claim 32, Smiga has further taught wherein said recording step comprises the step of associating the old version and the new version with a document history table when the old version and the new version are part of a family of documents, wherein the document history table stores data indicating changes made to each document in the family documents (Col 1 line 64 to Col 2 line 4).

Art Unit: 2155

22. Referring to claims 37-39, claims 37-39 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 30-32. Therefore, claims 37-39 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 30-32.

Conclusion

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objection made. Applicant must show how the amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR 1.111(c).
24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Liang-che Alex Wang whose telephone number is (703) 305-8159. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.
25. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T Alam can be reached on (703)308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.
26. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

Art Unit: 2155

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Liang-che Alex Wang *lcw*
July 8th, 2004

Hosain Alam
HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER